



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/909,500 | 07/20/2001 | Dave Ladouceur | 4622-122 US | 4933 |
| 25241 | 7590 | 05/04/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| MATHEWS, COLLINS, SHEPHERD & GOULD, PA | | | FRENEL, VANEL | |
| 100 THANET CR, SUITE 306 | | | ART UNIT | |
| PRINCETON, NJ 08540 | | | PAPER NUMBER | |

3626

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/909,500 | LADOUCEUR ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Vanel Frenel | 3626 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8152001&10192001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the application filed on 07/20/01. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cameron et al (6,202,062) in view of DeBusk et al (5,995,937).

(A) As per claim 1, Cameron discloses a method for integrated management of medical information comprising the steps of:

maintaining a digital database of medical information including product, product source and procedure (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27);

indexing the digital database of medical information by product, product source and procedure (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27);

receiving a query for medical information (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27);

filtering the response as a function of preference data (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27);

transmitting information found by searching and cross referencing (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27);

wherein access is provided to the medical information and the corresponding cross references (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27).

Cameron does not explicitly disclose that the method having searching the digital database of medical information by an index in response to the query for medical information; cross referencing the information found by searching to another index.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by DeBusk. In particular, DeBusk suggests that the method having having searching the digital database of medical information by an index in response to the query for medical information (See DeBusk, Col.15, lines 1-51); cross referencing the information found by searching to another index.(See Debusk, Col.16, lines 1-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of DeBusk within the system of Cameron with the motivation of providing software objects which are configurable by the user to represent healthcare related procedures in a fashion that allows for the development of custom software modules representative of the procedure for which information is to be managed.

(B) As per claim 2, DeBusk discloses the method wherein access to the medical information and the corresponding cross references is a function of the preference data (See DeBusk, Col.10, lines 14-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(C) As per claim 3, DeBusk discloses the method further comprising formatting the information found by searching and cross referencing so as to be indicative of a selection of the preference data (See (See DeBusk, Col.10, lines 14-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(D) As per claim 4, Debusk discloses the method wherein a selection of the preference data corresponds to qualifications of a particular user (See Debusk, Col.13, lines 1-34).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(E) As per claim 5, Debusk discloses the method wherein a selection of the preference data corresponds to a particular medical unit (See DeBusk, Col.10, lines 1-28).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(F) As per claim 6, Debusk discloses the method wherein the index used for searching the database corresponds to a medical procedure (See Debusk, Col.9, lines 20-67).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(G) As per claim 7, DeBusk discloses the method wherein a user may select products from a predetermined vendor for comparison (See Debusk, Col.5, lines 1-33).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(H) As per claim 8, DeBusk discloses the method wherein a user may select products and request additional information from a corresponding supplier without requiring further user action (See DeBusk, Col.15, lines 14-51).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(I) As per claim 9, Debusk discloses the method further comprising the step of initiating a purchase request for selected products from a particular vendor (See DeBusk, Col.5, lines 1-33).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, and incorporated herein.

(J) As per claim 10, Cameron discloses a system for integrated management of medical information in response to a request from a user computer comprising:

a database of medical information including product, product source and procedure (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27);

an index corresponding to the database of medical information by product, product source and procedure (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27);

communication device for receiving from a user computer a query for medical information (See DeBusk, Col.15, lines 52-67 to Col.16, line 27)

communication device for transmitting information found by the search engine and generated by the means for cross referencing to the user computer (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27);

wherein the user computer is enabled to access the medical information and the corresponding cross references (See Cameron, Col.37, lines 54 to Col.38, line 27).

Cameron does not explicitly disclose that the system having a search engine for searching the database of medical information by an index in response to the query for medical information (See DeBusk, Col.15, lines 1-51); means for cross referencing the information found by searching to another index; means for filtering the information found.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by DeBusk. In particular, DeBusk suggests that the system having a search engine for searching the

database of medical information by an index in response to the query for medical information; means for cross referencing the information found by searching to another index (See Debusk, Col.16, lines 1-27); means for filtering the information found (See Debusk, Col.16, lines 1-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of DeBusk within the system of Cameron with the motivation of providing software objects which are configurable by the user to represent healthcare related procedures in a fashion that allows for the development of custom software modules representative of the procedure for which information is to be managed.

(K) As per claim 15, DeBusk discloses the system wherein the preference data corresponds to a product supplier (See DeBusk, Col.15, lines 1-13).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 10, and incorporated herein.

(L) As per claim 19, DeBusk discloses the system wherein the selection of the preference data corresponds a particular level of skill/training with respect to a product (See DeBusk, Col.5, lines 1-47).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 10, and incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 3626

(M) As per claim 20, DeBusk discloses the system wherein the means for filtering is a function of the particular level of skill/training with respect to the product (See DeBusk, Col.5, lines 1-47).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk are as discussed above in the rejection of claims 1 and 10, and incorporated herein.

(N) Claims 11-14 and 16-18 recite the underlying process of the elements of claims 2-8, and respectively. As the various elements of claims 2-8 have been shown to be either disclosed by or obvious in view of the collective teachings of Cameron and DeBusk, it is readily apparent that the apparatus disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such, the limitations recited in claims 11-14 and 16-18 are rejected for the same reasons given above for the method claims 2-8, and incorporated herein.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not the applied prior art teaches remote demonstration of business capabilities in an e-commerce environment (6,345,239), system and method for aggregating distributed data (6,148,298), expert system for providing interactive assistance in solving problems such as healthcare management (5,517,405) and medical records, documentation, tracking and order entry system (5,823,948).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 571-272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

V.F
V.F

November 23, 2005


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER